

Appl. No.: 10/561,013

REMARKS

Claims 6-20 have been added above to claim the features recited therein.

One possible feature of the invention is to have small size terminals. Small size terminals require thin sheet metal, which allows small radius at bending. A drawback is that a spring blade made out of thin metal exerts a low pressing force. Therefore a means is required to enhance the pressing force.

A first class of solutions (such as in Sato) is to use a separate part pressing blade made of thicker and stiffer material, and hold it inside a terminal body made of thin metal. The separate blade can be made elastic, but having low electrical conductivity such as stainless steel. The body can be made of thin, soft and highly conductive copper. This costs much money because of the two parts to be made and to be mounted together.

Applicants' invention, on the other hand, is to add the force of a second auxiliary blade pressing on the main contact blade, in a unitary constructed terminal. This is less expensive to manufacture. However, the difficulty is then, after cutting and folding from blank sheet, to get the auxiliary blade being correctly positioned upon and in contact with the main blade, such a way the two forces are effectively added together. Applicants invention provides this solution.

In the office action mailed 2/13/2008, the examiner stated that "Sato discloses a terminal formed from a single metal plate". However, this appears to be incorrect. As can be

Appl. No.: 10/561,013

seen on Figs 1A to 1C, it discloses a terminal with a separate blade 18. It is written column 1 lines 53-58 "comprises a body ..., a resilient contact piece disposed in" in the background, column 1, line 35 "...contact piece 22 needs to be mounted within..." and "contact piece 22 can shake relative to body 21". The solution of Sato being column 1, line 62 "a resilient support portion" and column 2, line 27 "... since the support portion can be held against ... the movement is prevented",.. further column 3, line 27 "... opposite end portion of 12 spaced from each other...are held in contact with... inner body". Thus, there appears to be no material continuity (not a one-piece member). Figs. 1A and 1B clearly appear to show the contact piece 12 as being a separate member from the body 11.

In Sato the contact piece 12 is not "formed by folding a strip-like member".

In Sato the contact piece 12 does not have a free end in the meaning of applicants' claim one-piece member. On the contrary, it is "held in contact with body" (col 3 line 27) as a separate member.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Appl. No.: 10/561,013

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington 2/11/09
Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686) Date

Customer No.: 29683
Harrington & Smith, PC
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

2/11/2009
Date

Clair L. Main
Name of Person Making Deposit